



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/662,996	09/15/2003	Takashi Kawasaki	0828.68359	2241
24978 7590 11/26/2008 GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER MURDOUGH, JOSHUA A				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3621				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/662,996

Applicant(s)

KAWASAKI ET AL.

Examiner

JOSHUA MURDOUGH

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 21-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgements

1. This action is responsive to Applicants' amendment received 31 July 2008.
2. Claims 21-26 are pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra et al. (US 6,189,146) ("Misra") in view of Christiano (US 5,671,412).
5. As to claim 21, Misra shows:

A software execution management device for managing an execution status of software
whose execution is restricted by a license, comprising:

a read-only recording medium on which device identification information is recorded
(Figure 3, element 142), the device identification information uniquely identifying
the software execution management device (Figure 3, element 28)

license information storing means (Figure 3, element 112) storing license information
including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software
provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the
software simultaneously (Columns 6-7, lines 65-12);

identification information determining means (Figure 3, element 124) for determining whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same, when receiving an execution permission determination request from a computer connected via a network (Figure 3, element 126);

executing computer quantity determining means (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) for monitoring a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determining whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

software key decrypting means (Figure 3, element 128) for decrypting the software decryption key included in the license information with the key-specific encryption key when the identification information determining means determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining means determines that the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

decryption key managing means (Figure 3, element 136) for giving the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting means to the computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

hardware key connection means for reading attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano because it was a well known and it provided better security than a license alone.

6. As to claim 23, Misra shows:

A software execution management method for a software execution management device managing an execution status of software whose execution is restricted by a license, wherein:

identification information determining means (Figure 3, element 124) is provided with a read-only recording medium on which device identification information is recorded (Figure 3, element 142), and determines whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same when receiving an execution permission determination request from a computer connected via a

network (Figure 3, element 126), the device identification information uniquely identifying the software execution management device (Figure 3, element 28); executing computer quantity determining means (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) is provided with license information storing means storing license information including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously, and monitors a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determines whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

software key decrypting means (Figure 3, element 128) decrypts the software decryption key included in the license information with the attach/detach key-specific encryption key read from the hardware key when the identification information determining means determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining means determines that the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

decryption key managing means (Figure 3, element 136) gives the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting means to the computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

hardware key connection means reads attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano because it was a well known and it provided better security than a license alone.

7. As to claim 25, Misra shows:

A computer-readable recording medium storing a software execution management program for managing an execution status of software whose execution is restricted by a license, the software execution management program causing a computer provided with a read-only recording medium having recorded thereon device identification information uniquely identifying the computer to operate as: a license information storing unit (Figure 3, element 112) storing license information including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously (Columns 6-7, lines 65-12);

an identification information determining unit (Figure 3, element 124) for determining whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same when receiving an execution permission determination request from an execution target computer connected via a network (Figure 3, element 126);

an executing computer quantity determining unit (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) that monitors a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determines whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

a software key decrypting unit (Figure 3, element 128) for decrypting the software decryption key included in the license information with the key-specific encryption key read from the key when the identification information determining unit determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining unit determines that the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

a decryption key managing unit (Figure 3, element 136) for giving the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting unit to the execution target computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

a hardware key connection unit for reading attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano because it was a well known and it provided better security than a license alone.

8. Claims 22, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Misra and Chritiano and further in view of Long et al. (US 4,926,315) ("Long").

9. As to claim 22, Misra shows:

A software execution management device for managing an execution status of software whose execution is restricted by a license, comprising:

a read-only recording medium on which device identification information is recorded (Figure 3, element 142), the device identification information uniquely identifying the software execution management device (Figure 3, element 28)

license information storing means (Figure 3, element 112) storing license information including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software

provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously (Columns 6-7, lines 65-12);

first identification information determining means (Figure 3, element 124) for determining whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same, when receiving an execution permission determination request from a computer connected via a network (Figure 3, element 126);

executing computer quantity determining means (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) for monitoring a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determining whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

software key decrypting means (Figure 3, element 128) for decrypting the software decryption key included in the license information with the key-specific encryption key when the identification information determining means determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining means determines that the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

decryption key managing means (Figure 3, element 136) for giving the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting means to the computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

hardware key connection means for reading attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

second identification information determining means for determining whether the second device identification information included in the execution permission determination request matches anyone piece of chassis identification information included in the license information when receiving the execution permission determination request;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Long shows the formulation and comparison of a hard-wired chassis ID (Figure 26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano, and the chassis ID of Long in a the determining means of Misra for determining the key validity. The inclusion of the key would have been obvious because it provided better security than a license alone, and the use of the chassis ID in the determining means of Misra would have been obvious because it could have been performed without departing from the scope of Misra's invention and would allow for greater flexibility in for defining rules by the licensor.

10. As to claim 24, Misra shows:

A software execution management method for a software execution management device managing an execution status of software whose execution is restricted by a license, wherein:

first identification information determining means (Figure 3, element 124) is provided with a read-only recording medium on which device identification information is recorded (Figure 3, element 142), and determines whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same when receiving an execution permission determination request from a computer connected via a network (Figure 3, element 126), the device identification information uniquely identifying the software execution management device (Figure 3, element 28);
executing computer quantity determining means (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) is provided with license information storing means storing license information including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously, and monitors a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determines whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

software key decrypting means (Figure 3, element 128) decrypts the software decryption key included in the license information with the attach/detach key-specific encryption key read from the hardware key when the identification information determining means determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining means determines that the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

decryption key managing means (Figure 3, element 136) gives the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting means to the computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

hardware key connection means reads attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

second identification information determining means is provided with license information storing means storing license information including at least one piece of chassis identification information, an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software provided in an encrypted state, and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously, and determines whether the second device

identification information included in the execution permission determination request matches anyone piece of chassis identification information included in the license information when receiving the execution permission determination request, the chassis identification information specifying a chassis on which a plurality of computers can be mounted and that is permitted to execute the software with a computer mounted thereon;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Long shows the formulation and comparison of a hard-wired chassis ID (Figure 26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano, and the chassis ID of Long in a the determining means of Misra for determining the key validity. The inclusion of the key would have been obvious because it provided better security than a license alone, and the use of the chassis ID in the determining means of Misra would have been obvious because it could have been performed without departing from the scope of Misra's invention and would allow for greater flexibility in for defining rules by the licensor.

11. As to claim 26, Misra shows:

A computer-readable recording medium storing a software execution management program for managing an execution status of software whose execution is restricted by a license, the software execution management program causing a

computer provided with a read-only recording medium having recorded thereon device identification information uniquely identifying the computer to operate as:

a license information storing unit (Figure 3, element 112) storing license information including an encrypted software decryption key for decrypting the software provided in an encrypted state and a number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously (Columns 6-7, lines 65-12);

an identification information determining unit (Figure 3, element 124) for determining whether the permitted device identification information included in the key (client image, client signature, figure 3) and the device identification information are same when receiving an execution permission determination request from an execution target computer connected via a network (Figure 3, element 126);

an executing computer quantity determining unit (Figure 3, element 108; Column 9, lines 9-10) that monitors a number of executing computers executing the software, and when receiving the execution permission determination request, determines whether the number of computers that can execute the software simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Column 12, lines 41-55);

a software key decrypting unit (Figure 3, element 128) for decrypting the software decryption key included in the license information with the key-specific encryption key read from the key when the identification information determining unit determines sameness and the executing computing quantity determining unit determines that the number of computers that can execute the software

simultaneously is greater than the number of executing computers (Figure 4, step 164); and

a decryption key managing unit (Figure 3, element 136) for giving the software decryption key decrypted by the software key decrypting unit to the execution target computer (Figure 3, element 30) issuing the execution permission determination request (Figure 3, element 132).

Misra does not show:

a hardware key connection unit for reading attach/detach key information from a hardware key when the hardware key is attached, the attach/detach key information including an attach/detach key-specific encryption key and permitted device identification information specifying a permitted device, the hardware key storing the attach/detach key information;

a second identification information determining unit for determining whether the second device identification information included in the execution permission determination request matches anyone piece of chassis identification information included in the license information when receiving the execution permission determination request;

However, Christiano shows that hardware key devices were known, particularly in the area of business (multi-user) software licensing (Column 1, lines 15-48). Since the use of the hardware key was known, the use of a connection means must have also been inherently known. Long shows the formulation and comparison of a hard-wired chassis ID (Figure 26). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have

modified the teachings of Misra to include the hardware key of Christiano, and the chassis ID of Long in a the determining means of Misra for determining the key validity. The inclusion of the key would have been obvious because it provided better security than a license alone, and the use of the chassis ID in the determining means of Misra would have been obvious because it could have been performed without departing from the scope of Misra's invention and would allow for greater flexibility in for defining rules by the licensor.

Definitions

To the extent that the Examiner's interpretations are in dispute with Applicants' interpretations, the Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions—under the broadest reasonable interpretation standard—in all his claim interpretations.¹ Moreover, while the following list is provided in accordance with *In re Morris* (127F.3d 1048, 44 USPQ2d 1023 (Fed. Cir 1997)), the definitions are a guide to claim terminology since claim terms must be interpreted in context of the surrounding claim language. Finally, the following list is not intended to be exhaustive in any way:

Monitor: “4 : to keep track of, regulate, or control the operation of (as a machine or process).”

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield MA, 1986.

Response to Arguments

¹ While most definition(s) are cited because these terms are found in the claims, the Examiner may have provided additional definition(s) to help interpret words, phrases, or concepts found in the definitions themselves or in the prior art.

12. Applicant's arguments filed 31 July 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. Applicants argue:

“[T]he device of Misra et al. does not disclose or suggest such monitoring and determining whether the number of computers executing the software is greater than the permitted number” (Remarks, Page 15, Paragraph 1).

14. Examiner's response:

Misra teaches, keeping track of the allocated licenses in a record and updating the corresponding number assigned field to reflect the allocation (Column 15, lines 19-28). In view of the above definition of “monitor” this is interpreted as “monitoring the number of computers executing the software.” Misra also teaches that the number allocated field cannot exceed the number prescribed by the license pack (Id.). Therefore, this is a determination of whether the number of computers with licenses, and thus executing the software, is greater than the predetermined number.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

16. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JOSHUA MURDOUGH whose telephone number is (571)270-3270. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 7:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

18. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on (571) 272-6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

19. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Joshua Murdough
Examiner, Art Unit 3621

/Calvin L Hewitt II/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685